

REMARKS

Claims 1–24 are pending. Claims 1 and 16 are independent. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Allowable Subject matter

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Ly for the indication of allowable subject matter within Claims 4-15 and 20-24.

Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright (US 6,078,959). The applicant has carefully considered the opinions of the Office and further studied the reference documents again, and respectfully submits that Wright does not disclose all the features of claim 1 and 16.

As described in the present application, the present application relates particularly to a call access control method during call initiation or cell switching in a TDD CDMA mobile communication system (see paragraph 2 of the application). In a TDD CDMA mobile communication system, a time slot may be occupied by a plurality of subscribers at the same time. As described in the Description, the threshold of the number (i.e., the maximum number) of subscribers to be accessed per time slot supported by the base station may be 6~8 (see paragraph 18). Based on this background, the present application provides a call access control method which has the technical features as recited in Claim 1.

Wright provides a network server system that offers equity of access between network and subscriber-originated connection requests for respective pending calls, and the general object of the solution provided by Wright is to support equity of access between network and subscriber-originated connection requests at a respective network server system. Since the technical solution discussed in this reference document is not based on the CDMA technology (i.e., it is not mentioned by Wright that a time slot supports a plurality of subscribers), but discussed only about the random access signaling and connection request transmission, the solution provided in the present application cannot be disclosed or suggested by Wright.

Specifically, Wright discloses the following:

(1) column 4, lines 43-59, Wright describes a process of channel allocation and the interaction between the subscriber and the base station;

(2) column 7, lines 12-25, Wright describes a mechanism for preventing collision;

(3) column 5, lines 65 to column 6, line 4, Wright describes the time slots may be negotiated for and allocated, or assigned to an individual subscriber with a connection request;

(4) column 7, lines 55-61, Wright describes that a portion of the base station's time slots must be allocated for the transmission of poll messages and the reason thereof;

(5) column 2, lines 10-17, Wright describes an object to provide a network system that required minimum random access signaling and minimum subscriber-originated connection request transmissions for respective calls, whereas in the present application, idle resource units in a time slot with the minimum number of accessed subscribers are allocated;

(6) column 8, line 65 to column 9, line 4, Wright describes that a small population of subscribers with pending calls may grow when less connection resources are available during periods of heavy traffic loading;

(7) column 11, lines 19-24, Wright describes that sufficient time slots dedicated to random access signaling help reduce the chance of collision; and

(8) column 7, lines 55-61, Wright describes that a portion of a base station's time slots must be allocated for the transmission of poll messages for supporting subscriber-originated traffic (other portions of Wright mentioned by the Office have been discussed in the previous Reply).

As can be seen from above, nowhere does Wright discuss or disclose that a time slot has a plurality of accessed subscribers, so that the time slot having available channel resources and the minimum number of accessed subscribers may be allocated. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the technical features of "counting the number of accessed subscribers in all current communication time slots of the home base station for an access request, to determine channel resource occupations in different time slots; comparing said channel resource occupations in the different time slots, and then allocating idle resource units in the time slots having available channel resources and the minimum number of accessed subscribers to the

subscriber sending the access request," as recited originally in claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Wright et al.

Based on the above analysis, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 1 and claims 2-15 dependent on claim 1, as well as the corresponding apparatus claims 16-24, are not anticipated by Wright.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and should now be passed to issue. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees and to credit any overpayments that may be required by this paper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

April 14, 2008

By: 

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 783-6040 (voice)
(202) 783-6031 (fax)

Brian Rosenbloom
Registration No. 41,276

#1444680_2